

Screening Form
Low-Effect Incidental Take Permit Determination and
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
Environmental Action Statement

I. HCP Information

A. HCP Name:

Phillips 66 Cal Coast Pipeline Replacement (Project)

B. Affected Species:

- California tiger salamander (CTS; *Ambystoma californiense*): Federally endangered, Santa Barbara distinct population segment
- California red-legged frog (CRLF; *Rana draytonii*): Federally threatened

C. HCP Size (in stream miles and/or acres):

The project would result in temporary impacts to a maximum of 6.4 acres within the 50.9-acre Action Area.

D. Brief Project Description (including minimization and mitigation plans):

The Cal Coast pipeline is used to transport crude oil from the Orcutt Hill oil production leases to the Line 353 pipeline, which runs parallel to Graciosa Road on the east side. The Project proposes to replace the Cal Coast crude oil pipeline with a new 6-inch diameter, buried pipeline adjacent to the existing pipeline within the same right-of-way. The new pipeline will connect to the existing Line 300, a 12-inch pipeline east of Graciosa Road. Line 353 will be abandoned in place as will the remaining buried portions of the existing Cal Coast Line.

The Project involves constructing approximately 1.2 miles of 6-inch diameter pipeline with limited above ground structures as described below. The replacement pipeline will parallel the existing pipeline at approximately 5 feet off center within the same right-of-way. The replacement pipeline will begin at an existing facility pad in the oilfield and travel underground to a new tie-in with Line 300, which parallels Graciosa Road.

The Project includes these covered activities:

- Construction of a new 1.2-mile, 6-inch diameter buried pipeline located within the existing Cal Coast pipeline corridor beginning at the Cal Coast Lease site and terminating at Line 300 near Graciosa Road.
- Construction of a flow metering skid with an approximate 20-foot by 40-foot footprint and a maximum height of approximately 8 feet with a pig launcher facility with an approximate 20-

foot by 30-foot footprint and an approximate height of 3 feet. These aboveground features will be constructed within the active pad at the Pacific Coast Energy Company (PCEC) oil and gas facility on the Cal Coast Lease at the eastern terminus of the replacement Cal Coast pipeline.

- Construction of a pig receiver facility with an approximate 20-foot by 30-foot footprint and an approximate height of 3 feet with a below grade pipeline tie in to Line 300 adjacent to an existing valve box for Line 300 at the western terminus of the replacement pipeline near Graciosa Road.
- Vegetation clearing, grading, and excavations along the pipeline corridor.
- Equipment and materials staging areas.
- Use of existing roads (no new roads).
- The below grade portions of the existing Cal Coast pipeline will be abandoned in place.
- Where the existing Cal Coast pipeline is exposed at the two drainage crossings, the pipeline will be cut and capped approximately 10 feet from the embankments.

The Project construction corridor will vary in width depending on local features including slopes, drainages, and other utilities. The construction corridor is generally between 20 feet and 50 feet wide and does not exceed 60 feet. The Project footprint covers a total of approximately 6.4 acres, and approximately 3.5 acres of vegetation will be cleared during construction. Approximately 1,500 cubic yards (cy) of cut and fill and 100 cy of import and export will be necessary to complete the Project.

Minimization and mitigation measures were identified to ensure that the operating conservation program in the Habitat Conservation Plan is consistent with the conservation and recovery goals for these species. Biological Goals for this Project include: 1) avoidance and minimization of take, in the form of injury or mortality of CTS and CRLF; and 2) return of the action area to pre-construction conditions. Biological objectives are the components needed to achieve the biological goals and they are the rationale behind the minimization and mitigation strategies. The objectives are to: 1) develop and conduct a pre-construction worker environmental awareness program; 2) conduct pre-construction reconnaissance surveys for CTS and CRLF; 3) conduct daily biological clearances and construction monitoring, 4) Employ Stop Work Authority and relocate any CTS and/or CRLF observed; and 5) restore temporary disturbances of upland grassland habitat through revegetation.

Mitigation for incidental take to CTS and CRLF and the temporary disturbance of their habitat will be fulfilled through the purchase of 1 mitigation credit from the La Purisma Conservation Bank resulting in permanent protection of upland habitat. The Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office performed a habitat quality impact analysis using the Searcy and Shaffer 2008 model with an estimated temporary disturbance of 6.03 acres of CTS upland habitat during construction of the proposed Project which resulted in a determination of a reduction of 1,476.42 reproductive units. This is equivalent to 0.96 mitigation credits (1 credit = 1,515 reproductive units).

Construction is scheduled to occur between June 1, 2017 and October 15, 2017. Daily pre-activity surveys will track compliance with the HCP and ITP and help to identify any take of CTS or CRLF, meeting the objectives of compliance monitoring and effects monitoring. Effectiveness monitoring will be achieved following revegetation. Post-construction monitoring will occur to document when site conditions have returned to pre-construction conditions.

II. Does the HCP fit the following Department of Interior and Fish and Wildlife Service categorical-exclusion criteria?

A. Are the effects of the HCP minor or negligible on federally listed, proposed, or candidate species and their habitats covered under the HCP?

Answer: YES.

Incidental take of CTS that could result from implementation of covered activities within the Action Area is expected to be low, ranging between 0 and 3 individual CTS. Only a very small amount of suitable upland habitat for the species will be impacted (temporary impacts only) and the Action Area is in an area that is not considered necessary for recovery of the species (i.e., not within critical habitat). The Action Area is within the western edge of the West Los Alamos/Careaga metapopulation area identified in the Santa Barbara DPS Recovery Plan. The project entails only temporary impacts to upland habitat for CTS. For these reasons, the level of CTS incidental take that will result from Project implementation is negligible.

Incidental take of CRLF anticipated to result from implementation of covered activities within the Action Area is expected to be low, ranging between 0 and 2 CRLF, and predominantly in the form of capture and relocation. Only a very small amount of suitable upland habitat for the species will be impacted, and the Action Area is in an area that is not considered necessary for the recovery of the species (i.e., not within critical habitat or a conservation planning area identified in the Recovery Plan). Furthermore, the project will only result in temporary impacts to upland habitat for CRLF. For these reasons, the level of incidental take of CRLF that will result from Project construction is considered negligible.

B. Are the effects of the HCP minor or negligible on all other components of the human environment, including environmental values and environmental resources (e.g. air quality, geology and soils, water quality and quantity, socio-economic, cultural resources, recreation, visual resources, environmental justice, etc.), prior to implementation of the minimization and mitigation measures?

Answer: YES.

The project will result in negligible temporary effects to other environmental values or resources (primarily grazed annual non-native grassland and active oilfield areas). The project will lessen the risk of possible future impacts by replacing an old oil pipeline.

C. Would the incremental impacts of this HCP, considered together with the impacts of

other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions) not result, over time, in a cumulative effects to the human environment (the natural and physical environment) which would be considered significant?

Answer: YES.

Pipeline replacement projects in the area are uncommon, and as with the proposed project, they typically require only temporary impacts to upland habitat. Potential future repair or replacement work on the Phillips 66 300 Line pipeline network will be temporary and have a narrow disturbance footprint. Impacts to the covered species can be avoided, minimized, and mitigated to avoid cumulative significant effects to the species.

III. Do any of the exceptions to categorical exclusions (extraordinary circumstances) listed in 43 CFR 46.215 apply to this HCP?

Would implementation of the HCP:

A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?

Answer: NO.

This project will not result in significant adverse effects to public health and safety. In fact, this project would result in a net benefit to public health and safety by replacing an older pipeline with new materials and new pipeline operational safety systems.

B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as: historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990) or floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds, eagles, or other ecologically significant or critical resources?

Answer: NO.

This project will not result in adverse effects to these resources.

C. Have highly controversial environmental effects (defined at 43 CFR 46.30), or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [see NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?

Answer: NO.

There is neither anticipation nor expectation of any controversial effects. This project is a like for like replacement and does not alter oil production or supply volumes.

D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects, or involve

unique or unknown environmental risks?

Answer: NO.

Phillips 66 standard operating protocols include the evaluation of environmental risks and mitigation for potential hazards through engineering and other controls. The potential risks of the project and subsequent operation of the pipeline when built are well understood. The project includes new materials and other safety components to reduce risk compared to the existing condition.

E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?

Answer: NO.

Use of a low effect HCP for this project is not unique nor precedent setting.

F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?

Answer: NO.

This project is not directly related to any other proposed or foreseeable actions that would result in cumulatively significant environmental effects. This project involves the like-for-like replacement of an existing pipeline. It does not create the opportunity for new or increased oil production levels. Pipeline maintenance and upgrade activities are standard practices.

G. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places?

Answer: NO.

This project has no effect on historic places. No known structures or historic places are within or adjacent to the project location.

H. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?

Answer: NO.

No, the project has minimal effects on the covered species and would not impact the recovery of either species. The proposed project is located outside the designated critical habitat boundaries of CTS and CRLF.

I. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law, or a requirement imposed for the

protection of the environment.

Answer: NO.

This project does not threaten to violate any laws protecting the environment.

J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).

Answer: NO.

This project will not result in adverse effects to low income or minority populations.

K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).

Answer: NO.

This project will not result in adverse effects to Indian sacred sites.

L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).

Answer: NO.

This project will not contribute to problems associated with noxious weeds or non-native invasive plant species.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION STATEMENT

Within the spirit and intent of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act and other statutes, orders, and policies that protect fish and wildlife resources, I have established the following administrative record.

Based on the information and analysis above, I determine that the proposed Incidental Take Permit for the Phillips 66 Cal Coast Pipeline Replacement Project HCP qualifies for a categorical exclusion, as defined in 40 CFR 1508.4 and in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service *Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook*. Furthermore, no extraordinary circumstances identified in 43 CFR 46.215 exist for the Phillips 66 Cal Coast Pipeline Replacement Project HCP project. Therefore, the Service's permit action for the Phillips 66 Cal Coast Pipeline Replacement Project HCP is categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation, as provided by 40 CFR 1507.3; 43 CFR 46.205; 43 CFR 46.215; 516 DM 3; 516 DM 8.5; and 550 FW 3.3C. A more extensive NEPA process is unwarranted, and no further NEPA documentation will be made.

Other supporting documents [list]:

Cal Coast Pipeline Replacement Project Low-Effect Habitat Conservation Plan

Signature Approval:


[name]

2/16/17
Date

Field Supervisor or as appropriate per Regional procedures
[Field Office name]